DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 186 EC 131 313

AUTHOR Williams, Ellen U.
TITLE Coping Strategies for Implementing P.L. 94-142: Four Papers.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 21p.: Paper presented at the Annual International Convention of The Council for Exceptional Children (58th, Philadelphia, PA, April, 1980, Session T-83).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compliance (Legal): Delivery Systems: *Disabilities: Elementary Secondary Education: Federal Legislation: *Handicap Identification: Information Dissemination: *Inservice Teacher Education: *Learning Resources Centers: Parent Education: Preservice Teacher Education: Universities
IDENTIFIERS Child Find: *Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

Four papers focus on efforts to implement P.L. 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. The first outlines preservice and inservice approaches to teacher education, including introduction of the law in a course on the exceptional child which is required for all undergraduate education majors, and cooperation with a regional resource center to provide inservice. The second paper reports on a project to assist local school districts identify unserved handicapped children through an awareness campaign which was not favorably perceived by administrators. Addressed in the third paper is an inservice approach to helping regular educators deal with special needs students. Delivery methods and content options are briefly considered. The final paper analyzes the role of special education resource centers in inservice education (including workshops for parents as well as teachers) and information dissemination (including publication of a newsletter and due process guidelines for parents). (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED196186

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Coping Strategies for Implementing P. L. 94-142: Four Papers

Dr. Ellen Williams, Assistant Professor
Department of Special Education
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403

Mr. Paul Gilson, IPD Coordinator
10142 Dowling Road
Bowling Green, OH 43402

Mr. Karl Lysinger, Consultant
Instructional Resource Center
10142 Dowling Road
Bowling Green, OH 43402

Mrs. Betty McMillan, Coordinator
Instructional Resource Center
10142 Dowling Road
Bowling Green, OH 43402

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Betty McMillan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 131313

COPING STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING P. L. 94-142--

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Ellen Williams, Assistant Professor
Department of Special Education
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

COPING STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING P. L. 94-142--

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Ellen U. Williams

The role of the university in providing assistance for implementation of P. L. 94-142 is two fold. Teacher Education programs must address the issues of 1. Pre-service: adequately preparing all prospective educators in implementing the mandates of the law and 2. In-service: assisting practicing educators in fulfilling their responsibilities in the Education for All Handicapped Children Act.

Bowling Green State University has been shaping its new role in teacher education through some of the following activities:

Pre-Service

All undergraduate education majors must take a course on the exceptional child. Within this course, P. L. 94-142 is introduced.

A faculty retreat was held for teacher educators (general and special) to discuss P. L. 94-142 and the implications for cooperative change in the teacher education program.

Faculty members (general and special) have been sent to conferences on P. L. 94-142 such as the Joint Conference for Teacher Educators sponsored by the Ohio Deans' Task Force for Personnel Preparation for the Handicapped, the Ohio Association of Teacher Educators and the Ohio Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.

Some faculty members of general and special education have experimented with team teaching in the methods classes.

Special Education faculty have acted as consultants and speakers for general education classes and student projects.

Special Education faculty are analyzing research surveys from practicing educators in order to improve its delivery of teacher education.

An advisory board, comprised of practicing educators in Northwest Ohio and Special Education faculty members meet to discuss the mission and programs of the Special Education Department.

In-Service

The Department has implemented a liaison model for inservice models for inservice programs; this model interfaces the resources of the University with local, county, and regional education agencies.

The Special Education Department works cooperatively with the Northwest Ohio Special Education Regional Resource Center in providing inservice meetings and courses related to the law.

The Special Education Department has just received a grant to offer Regular Educator Inservice (non-degree).

The Special Education faculty serve as consultants for local inservice programs on P. L. 94-142.

In essence, the role of the university is to meet the challenge of training and retraining teachers, administrators and support personnel to be prepared to function effectively in a mainstreamed environment.

COPING STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING P. L. 94-142--

SERVICES PROVIDED FOR SUPPORT PERSONNEL IN

IMPLEMENTING CHILD FIND

Mr. Paul Gilson, I. P. D. Coordinator
10142 Dowling Road
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

P.L. 94-142 of the Education of Handicapped Children Act of 1975 requires each state to provide an annual plan (going to a 3 year plan in 1980, for 1981-83) to BEH for their approval. The Division of Special Education as part of the Ohio State Department of Education has the responsibility of developing the state's annual plan. One part of the plan includes the SERRCs, which was mentioned earlier.

The Identification and Program Development (IPD) Project as one of the projects under the SERRC has mandates or service functions as defined by the Division of Special Education. The IPD Project has nine service functions. The major emphasis of these service functions is to provide technical assistance to administrators of Special Education programs to meet compliance of the mandates of P.L. 94-142 and HB 455, Ohio's compliance law for P.L. 94-142. Within the 13 counties which comprise the SERRC Region, there are fourteen (14) city districts, eight (8) exempted village districts, sixty-one (61) local districts, thirteen (13) county offices, thirteen (13) 169 Boards (provides programs for trainable mentally retarded) and four (4) Joint Vocational School Districts (JVSD). Just as the IRC must send out a needs assessment survey, so must the IPD Project. The needs assessment survey is sent to all Superintendents of public schools and administrative personnel of Special Education programs in the region. The purpose of the needs assessment is to assist the IPD Project in priortizing and planning for the provision of services as related to the service functions.

Now back to the state's annual plan. Included in the state's annual plan are to be detailed provisions for the identification, location and evaluation of handicapped children as an ongoing procedure. This is made clear in Part 121a.128, of the Rules and Regulations for Implementa-

tion of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act of 1975. Part 121a.220 of the above mentioned rules and regulations relates to the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) responsibility for child identification. In Ohio, LEAs include 615 school districts comprised of city, exempted villages, county offices and locals under the jurisdiction of county offices.

The LEAs operate under the mandate of HB 455 which was passed by the Ohio General Assembly in 1976 to meet the mandates of 94-142. HB 455 then became part of the Ohio Revised Code (ORC). School districts were required by Section 3323.00 of ORC to submitt a "455 Plan" as it came to be called to comply with the requirements for Child Identification. Ohio, under section 3323 ORC requires that each school district have policies and procedures for an ongoing in-school, out-of-school, and Child Information Management Systems (CIMS).

As part of each districts out-of-school identification system each district must implement an intensive Awareness Campaign beginning in 1978 and every 3rd year thereafter. The major effort of the Intensive Awareness Campaign is an attempt to reach every household in every school district by direct contact, mail, T.V. and newspaper. The purpose is to locate any suspected unserved handicapped child. This is seen by most administrative personnel as an additional responsibility they do not need. Especially when the results do not appear to justify the cost in dollars and staff time. But first let me share with you the activities employed by the IPD Project to assist districts in meeting this mandate.

1. Thirty-five (35) "contact" persons or Child-Find Coordinators were identified representing the thirteen (13) county region.
2. Planning sessions were held in the six (6) Task Force sub-regions,

in single counties and single school districts.

3. Thirteen (13) additional radio tapes were requested and given to the appropriate "contact person" to be delivered to the identified radio station.
4. Two - sixty (60) second tapes were delivered to each of the five (5) television stations in the regions located in Toledo and Bowling Green.
5. 162,969 flyers were delivered to school districts in this region for their individual needs.
6. Aside from the major newspaper in our area (Toledo Blade, circulation 173,000), some school districts elected to also use their own local newspaper for notification purposes.
7. A Notice: Identification Campaign for Handicapped Children was sent to nearly 2,500 school personnel, agencies and parents in the region through the NWO/SERRC Newsletter.
8. A survey was made of the television and radio stations as to their participation in the Awareness Campaign. (Of the 18 sent only 3 were returned.)
9. A survey was also sent to each school district in the region as to cost effectiveness.

After the Intensive Awareness Campaign was completed in our region a survey was made by this project. Surveys were sent to the thirty-five (35) identified "Child-Find Coordinators," eighteen (18) were returned. The returns reflected the following:

1. $14,221.28 was spent on Campaign Activities.
2. 2,110 estimated man hours were used.
3. 32 referrals were made.

4. 17 new out-of-school students were located.

5. 8 new in-school students were located.

This above information is preceived by administrators indicating that the Intensive Awareness Campaign effort is not worth it.

Now I would like to speak to some of the problems in attempting to provide follow-up on indicated needs assessed as being important by administrators. Based on a Needs Assessment Survey this project established three workshops or inservice meetings with the assistance of IRC monies. Upon completion of the meetings an analysis was done to determine how many survey respondents came to an established meeting for which they noted on the Needs Assessment Survey as a priority to them.

Attendance for each of the meetings was nearly equal to or more than the number who requested assistance. However, the percent of those who indicated a need for assistance on the survey as compared to those who actually attended, ran from 8% to 35%. In other words, many more personnel indicated a need for assistance than came to the meetings. There could be many reasons for this. However, it does indicate a problem in attempting to provide assistance.

REFERENCES

1. Amended Substitute House Bill No. 455 - General Assembly of Ohio 1976

2. Rules and Regulations Title 45 - Implementation of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act; Federal Register August, 1977

COPING STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING P. L. 94-142--

SERVICES PROVIDED FOR REGULAR EDUCATORS

Mr. Karl Lysinger, Consultant
Instructional Resource Center
10142 Dowling Road
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

Implementation of P.L. 94-142 is an issue in the forefront of education today. Upon further investigation, one can clearly view the emerging challenge facing educators in the 80's, namely, that of disseminating, sharing and educating school personnel to key aspects of the law and the establishment of an effective means of delivering training that encourages an actualized program of instruction that benefits not only the special student but all students. One means of meeting this challenge is by offering opportunities for staff development through inservice training of the regular educator. The Northwest Ohio Instructional Resource Center has accepted this challenge with zeal and enthusiasm. However, as with most new legislation, one continues to "test the water" to assess the means to best accomplish the task at hand.

Provision for inservice training for the regular educator involves the consideration of three basic variables. These are: (1) local demographics, (2) local areas of concern in compliance with P.L. 94-142, and (3) methods of delivering inservice programming.

The basis for all planning of inservice training is generated from a needs assessment as stated in the previous presentation. I mention that again because most recommendations stated here are generated from that first seed of IRC involvement.

Our first critical concern is the demography of the school district requesting our services. This is crucial for the needs and attitudes of special and regular teachers and administrators may vary depending upon whether the district is urban, suburban, or rural in nature. This data enables the IRC consultant to better

focus upon an inservice model that best suites the district's need in addressing the regular educator's concerns. Issues that surface at this point influence the success or failure of a potential inservice program. Briefly, a few of these considerations are: (1) the willingness of the regular education staff to participate in a team approach in designing inservice programs; (2) the willingness of regular staff to attend inservice training sessions; (3) the best time to present inservice programs; (4) the motivational techniques necessary to attract participants. When these questions are resolved, we can address content areas for presentation.

In most school districts, an effort is made to form a team consisting of an administrator, regular education teacher, special education teacher and psychologist or counselor to work with the IRC consultant in determining content of the inservice program or programs if continued throughout the year. Topic areas of inservice training include: (1) sensitivity training, workshops simulating handicapping conditions of regular staff in performing routine tasks; (2) the definition of Least Restrictive Alternative and methods of implementation; (3) methods of implementing individualized instruction; (4) the overview of Due Process and its import to regular educators; (5) the overview of the Individual Educational plan and its meaning for the regular educator; (6) the overview confidentiately legislation; (7) parent counseling techniques and the special child; (8) make-it take-it workshops; (9) methods of instruction for the special child, and (10) overview of P.L. 94-142.

Our final consideration is to determine the best method of delivery for a particular inservice content area. Once again, we try to solicit input from the team formed at the district level as mentioned earlier. Usually the inservice format consists of (1) modules of instruction created and presented by IRC consultants which may be a combination of lecture and audience participation, straight lecture or lecture and video tapes. Our most frequently used presentation is a video tape program containing twenty half-hour topics entitled STRETCH. STRETCH is an acronym for Strategies for Training Regular Educators to Teach Children with Handicaps. This has been a mainstay in our center in providing inservice to the regular educator.

In conclusion, we have tried to briefly outline an approach to meeting the challenges presented by the advent of 94-142. We hope that this portion of the program has been beneficial in providing helpful information that may assist you in attending to your responsibilities in your home districts.

COPING STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING P. L. 94-142--

THE ROLE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS

Mrs. Betty McMillan, Coordinator
Instructional Resource Center
10142 Dowling Road
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402

In order to give you some idea of who we are and what we are, I would like to briefly explain Ohio's SERRC concept and particularly the IRC component.

The Ohio Division of Special Education has divided Ohio into 16 regions. Each of these regions has a Special Education Regional Resource Center or as we call them, SERRC's. Each of the SERRC's has 3 projects attached to them - 1 is the EAP, which stands for educational assessment project; another is the IPD, which stands for Identification and Program Development Project; and the 3rd is the Instructional Resource Center, or better known as the IRC. Each of these projects has a coordinator, and I am the coordinator of the IRC. All these projects are federally funded by Title VI-B (EHA) funds and we all submit proposals to the Division of Special Education specifying what we plan on doing to answer to P.L. 94-14], and requesting money to cover personnel and the activities needed to carry out the proposal.

The IRC started 12 years ago and at that time we worked with only 3 counties in N.W. Ohio. A few years later, we added 10 additional counties and have served these counties ever since. At the present time, our staff includes 2 consultants and 5 part-time aides - 2 of whom work in our 2 satellite centers. Next year we are requesting 3 additional consultants in order to better serve our large geographic area. At the present time, it is not unusual for our consultants to travel 200 miles a day in providing inservice for our rural areas.

Basically, the IRC has 2 main functions: (1) a large collection of instructional materials that we loan to teachers and other people

working with handicapped students, and (2) inservice on many topics for all school personnel and parents. The Division of Special Education has chosen the IRC as their mechanism for delivering inservice.

Needless to say, with a geographic area as large as ours, the needs of the various school districts are quite different. Our rural areas have quite a different need from Toledo, one of Ohio's major cities.

In order to make the inservice worthwhile and effective, we do two things to find out what the needs of our region are: (1) we meet with key people in each county (supervisors, directors of special education, principals, and occasionally, superintendents) to find out what they feel their teachers' needs are. Along with this, (2) we send out a needs assessment which has been developed around the mandates of P.L. 94-142 and, in the past, has been sent out to our mailing list of approximately 3,500 people. This year, we wanted to reach more people - particularly the regular education teacher - so we sent out approximately 13,000 needs assessments. So far, we have had over 1,500 returned. We then tabulate and prioritize the needs by county and city (explain form). After this, we go back and meet with the group of people we met with before. We compare the results of the needs assessment with what they felt were the needs and then start to plan inservice with them and for them.

We do inservice at various levels: (1) regional meetings that include all 13 counties; (2) sub-regional meetings that include 2 to 4 counties; and (3) county meetings for one county or one or more

school districts - even one building. We work with regular and special teachers, support personnel, administrators, parents, bus drivers; physical education, industrial education, home economics, music and art teachers - just about anyone who is working with handicapped students.

We have inservice meetings conducted by our IRC consultants, and needless to say, that is the major portion of them. We bring in program consultants that we feel have expertise in a particular area. These could be nationally known persons, university personnel, State Department personnel, or an outstanding teacher in one of our schools. We offer university credit for some inservice; however, any of the inservice offered for credit can also be attended for non-credit (show syllabus as an example).

We've planned inservice for parent groups around these booklets on the Parent/Professional Partnership and we've used a consultant trained in PET (Parent Effectiveness Training). We've provided inservice on IEP's, Due Process, Classroom Management, Cooperation between the Special and Regular Teacher, and materials and how to use them, to name a few.

A workshop that has been very popular is the Make-It--Take-It workshop. These occur about 3 times a week in various locations around the region and one Saturday a month in the main center. We furnish ideas, supplies and equipment such as laminators and film, poster board, colored dots and felt pens, paper cutter, idea books and examples, patterns, and other things to help teachers make all kinds of teaching aids. They make some very worthwhile things and have fun doing it.

When you do this many inservice meetings for such a variety of people, there are sure to be a few that aren't received very well. I remember when we first found out about IEPs. We were charged with doing inservice with special education teachers on how to put together an IEP. We constructed what we felt was a nice little package on IEPs and we started around the region. Well, we just about got run out of the region. Teachers - and administrators - were not ready for this. They had not been prepared and the attitude was there was NO way they were going to do this. Their attitude was "don't tell us about it because it's going to go away". Well, as we all know, it didn't go away and so in a few months we had many requests to come back and do inservice on IEPs. We also realized something - hindsight, you know - we should have done inservice with the principals before we tried to do it with teachers. Now we really try to foresee this type of problem when we plan inservice.

Another function of the IRC is the dissemination of information. We send out a monthly newsletter to approximately 3,500 people to keep the region abreast of what is happening concerning legislation for handicapped persons; flyers on inservice meetings we have scheduled; university course offerings, etc. We also disseminate publications such as this Due Process handbook for parents put out by the Division of Special Education; this Primer for Parents put together by the Central Ohio SERRC. Another large job was the compilation and dissemination of a Tutor Training notebook.

Copies of all these things I have mentioned will be available

at the close of this meeting and I hope, in this short period of time, I have given you some idea of how the IRC is trying to cope with P.L. 94-142. If you have any questions, I will be happy to try to answer them at the end of this session.